

REMARKS

The Final Office Action of November 4, 2009, (“the Office Action”) has been carefully reviewed and the remarks that follow are responsive thereto. Claim 1 has been amended. No claims have been canceled. Claims 25-30 were previously canceled. Claims 42-44 have been added. No new matter has been introduced. Claims 1-24 and 31-44 are thus pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 13-16, 19-21, 31-36, and 40-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,693,874 to Shaffer et al. (“Shaffer”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,731,609 to Hirni et al. (“Hirni”) and further in view U.S. Patent No. 6,728,236 to Potter et al. (“Potter”). Claims 5-6, 10-12, 17-18, 22-24, and 37-39 stand rejected over Shaffer in view of Hirni and Potter and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,584,093 to Salama et al. (“Salama”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Independent claim 1 recites a method comprising, *inter alia*:

applying, at the router, a connection control issued by the service control point to the separate media components, wherein the connection control enables:

modification of terminal capability information of the control signaling message related to the separate media components, and

separate relaying of the component specific control signaling message to a respective one of the separate media components related.

(Emphasis added). The Office Action concedes, at page 5, that Shaffer does not teach or suggest modification of terminal capability information of the control signaling message. The Office Action asserts, at page 5, however, that Potter discloses modification of terminal capability information of the control signaling message related to separate media components at 7:13-29 and 5:49-61. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In pertinent part, Potter states:

In order to transfer the call from endpoint 1 to endpoint 2, the Gatekeeper first of all issues CloseLogicalChannel signals to both the Gateway and to endpoint 1. Both of these return CloseLogicalChannelAck signals back to the Gatekeeper. An EndSessionCommand is then issued by the Gatekeeper to endpoint 1, but this is not passed on to the Gateway. The call to endpoint 1 is

Amendment dated February 4, 2010

Reply to Final Office Action of November 4, 2009

then cleared by a REL COMP message, and a new call to endpoint 2 is set up by means of an outgoing SETUP and a return CONNECT signal. The Gatekeeper now has to make sure that the Gateway learns about the correct capabilities of the terminal at endpoint 2, without being aware that the endpoint itself has changed. It then issues a RequestMode signal to the Gateway, which may cause an OpenLogicalChannel request. This is then passed on by the Gateway to the endpoint 2, thereby opening up the logical channel with that endpoint. In this implementation, the Gatekeeper is acting very much like a Multipoint Controller (MC).

Potter at 7:13-30 (emphasis added). While Potter thus describes a scenario in which a call is transferred from one endpoint to another and in which a gatekeeper “has to make sure that the [g]ateway learns about the correct capabilities of the terminal at [the other] endpoint,” Potter is devoid of any teaching or suggestion of modification of terminal capability information of the control signaling message related to the separate media components, as recited in independent claim 1. In addition, neither Hirni nor Salama cures the deficiencies of Potter. Because Shaffer, Hirni, Potter, and Salama thus fail to teach or suggest the above discussed features of independent claim 1, the asserted combination of the references would not have resulted in the invention as claimed. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is allowable.

Independent claims 13 and 31 recite features similar to those of independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claims 13 and 31 are allowable for substantially similar reasons as independent claim 1.

Claims 2-4, 7-9, 14-16, 19-21, 32-36, and 40-41 ultimately depend from one of independent claims 1, 13, and 31, and are thus allowable by virtue of their dependence and further in view of the various novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

Claims 5-6, 10-12, 17-18, 22-24, and 37-39 ultimately depend from one of independent claims 1, 13, and 31, and are thus allowable by virtue of their dependence and in view of the various novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

New Claims

Claims 42-44 have been added. Claims 42, 43, and 44 depend from independent claims 1, 13, and 31, respectively, and Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claims 42-44 are allowable by virtue of their dependence and further in view of the various features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

All issues having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or if there are any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3000.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: February 4, 2010

By: /Rajit Kapur/

Rajit Kapur
Registration No. 65,766

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051

Tel: 202.824.3000
Fax: 202.824.3001

CAM/RK